184 CHESTNUT PLAIN ROAD PO BOX 505 WHATELY, MA 01093

July 23, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Re: Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as Amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Third Report and Order – MB Docket No. 05-311

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I am writing as a private citizen to express my objection to the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") proposed Third Report and Order ("Order") requiring Local Franchising Authorities ("LFA") to treat cable-related, in-kind contributions as franchise fees subject to the statutory five percent franchise fee cap, and regarding the LFA's ability to use its cable franchising authority to regulate the mixed-use network of an incumbent cable operator that is not a common carrier. This change in practice is almost certain to result in a drastic reduction in public, educational and governmental (PEG) programming across the country, by allowing for-profit cable companies to charge a new set of fees. The proposed change is not in the public interest, and will result in dramatically reduced opportunities for communication that is in the public good.

I live in a town of fewer than 1500 individuals for which the full range of municipal and governance activities are carried out by a few paid staff members and a large array of volunteers who populate multiple committees. Our local PEG access organization, Frontier Community Access Television (FCAT) provides an invaluable service by filming and providing free access to films of multiple public hearings and open meetings. FCAT's services are embedded in the community, and we will suffer considerably were those services to become unavailable due to the inevitable increased costs should the FCC proceed with the proposed change in practice. I urge the FCC to safeguard the public interest by maintaining the current franchise fee structure and honoring the authority of cities and towns to control their public rights-of-way.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Donna L. Wiley